

Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Pallone

Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano

Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Yarmuth

NOES—251

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodi
Austria
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Benishek
Berg
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bono Mack
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brooks
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes

Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Huelskamp
Huiuzenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo

Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Myrick
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paul
Paulsen
Pearce
Peterson
Petri
Platts
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Rahall
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roe
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross (AR)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schradner
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)

Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton

Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Woolsey
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Johnson (IL)

NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman
Bachmann
Bass (NH)
Blumenauer
Bonner
Boren
Brown (FL)
Calvert
Campbell
Carnahan
Cleaver
Coble

Diaz-Balart
Giffords
Hall
Hinchey
Holden
Markey
McCaul
Oliver
Pence
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis

Quigley
Rangel
Reyes
Roskam
Ross (FL)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Shuler
Sires
Welch
Wilson (FL)

□ 1450

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAWFORD) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2250) to provide additional time for the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue achievable standards for industrial, commercial, and institutional boilers, process heaters, and incinerators, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall 765, I, along with Mr. HOYER, Congresswoman WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SMITH, and other Members, was present at the decommissioning ceremony of Commander Mark Kelly, who was there with his wife, our colleague, GABBY GIFFORDS. For that reason, we missed that rollcall vote.

For myself, had I been present, I would have voted "no" on the motion to table the resolution.

I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 766, the Waxman bill, to protect our children from mercury.

I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 767, Mr. RUSH's amendment.

My colleague, the distinguished Democratic whip, says that he and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ would have voted similarly.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2832, TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE EXTENSION ACT OF 2011; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3078, UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3079, UNITED STATES-PANAMA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3080, UNITED STATES-KOREA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-240) on the resolution (H. Res. 425) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2832) to extend the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3078) to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3079) to implement the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3080) to implement the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring as to the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House is not in session in observation of the Columbus Day holiday. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. The last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m. on Friday.

On Tuesday, the House will consider a few bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. Also on Tuesday, the House will complete action on H.R. 2250, the EPA Regulatory Relief Act, and take up the rule for the three free trade agreements and the Trade Adjustment Assistance bill; therefore, Members are advised that the 6:30 p.m. vote series will be longer than usual.

On Wednesday, the House will consider H.R. 3078, the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act; H.R. 3079, the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act; H.R. 3080, the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act; and H.R. 2832, extending the Generalized System of Preferences, as amended by the Senate.

On Thursday, the House will consider H.R. 358, the Protect Life Act, sponsored by Representative JOE PITTS. Then finally, on Friday, the House will consider H.R. 2273, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act, sponsored by Representative DAVE MCKINLEY of West Virginia.

The Boiler MACT bill, the three free trade agreements and Mr. MCKINLEY's regulatory relief bill are all part of the House Republican plan for America's job creators.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information.

Before I talk about the American Jobs Act, does the majority leader have an estimate from either CBO or any economist on how many jobs over the next 24 months might be created as a result of the passage of those bills, the bills to which you refer as the House Republican plan for America's job creators?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman that I am very entertained by the nature of his question since, I guess, it starts from the fact that some might believe that Congress creates jobs. But I would say in general, Mr. Speaker, that what we need to be doing here is to create an environment where entrepreneurs and small businesses and investors can actually feel confident again to put capital at risk to create jobs.

I would say to the gentleman further that the administration, itself, has accepted the notion that the passage of the three free trade agreements will have the potential—there's no guarantee—but the potential of the creation of a quarter of a million jobs.

Again, there have been a lot of promises made in this town, Mr. Speaker, about how we're going to control the level of unemployment and make sure it doesn't go beyond certain points connected with the stimulus bill, but I think the American people have had just about enough of broken promises. So we are proceeding with a focus, a focus like a laser, on creating an environment for entrepreneurs and small businesses to create jobs without making promises, Mr. Speaker, that will then let people down. We're trying to regain the confidence of the people and put some sensible regulatory policy in place with a lower tax environment so we can see growth return to a badly needed macroeconomic environment.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that answer.

What I took from that answer is there is no estimate of jobs that might be created in the next 24 months. That's what I took from your answer.

In terms of not creating jobs but creating an environment, I agree with the gentleman that we need to create an environment for jobs, but I don't believe that I've seen any estimates that your agenda will create jobs. As a matter of fact, I've seen the opposite.

Mr. Bruce Bartlett, the former adviser to President Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush, was quoted just a few days ago. I know the gentleman is smiling because he knows this quote:

"Republicans have a problem. People are increasingly concerned about unemployment, but Republicans have nothing to offer them," Mr. Bartlett said, not me. "The GOP opposes additional government spending for jobs programs and, in fact, favors big cuts in spending that," Mr. Bartlett said, "would be likely to lead to further layoffs at all levels of government."

He goes on to say:

"Republicans favor tax cuts for the wealthy and corporations, but these had no stimulative effect during the George W. Bush administration"—of course, we lost 8 million jobs, as the gentleman will recall, during that period of time—"and there is no reason to believe that more of them will have any today."

□ 1500

He goes on to say: "And the Republicans' oft-stated concern for the deficit makes tax cuts a hard sell. On August 29, the House majority leader, ERIC CANTOR of Virginia, sent a memorandum to members of the House Republican Conference telling them to make the repeal of job-destroying regulations."

This is Mr. Bartlett, former Reagan aide and former aide to George H.W. Bush, both Republican Presidents. Mr. Bartlett goes on to say: "Evidence supporting Mr. CANTOR's contention that deregulation would increase employment is very weak. As one can see, the number of layoffs nationwide caused by government regulation is minuscule and shows no evidence of getting worse during the Obama administration."

Mr. Reagan was quoted, we have a nice quote, I am sure you have seen it, that indicates that people ought to pay their fair share of taxes as well.

The President has offered the American Jobs Act. He has offered the American Jobs Act and economist after economist after economist says that it will create jobs. It will create jobs by creating an environment, by giving more money to small businesses, giving more money to consumers in their pocket.

I know your side has talked a lot about that and that as a result of both businesses having more money in their pocket and consumers having more money in their pocket, that that environment of which you speak will be created, and a number of people think that they will create significant numbers of jobs as a result.

As a matter of fact, the macroeconomic advisers projected the plan

would add roughly 1.25 percentage points to GDP, to gross domestic product, and create 1.3 million jobs.

JPMorgan Chase estimated the plan would increase growth by almost 2 points and add 1.5 million jobs. Moody's Analytics forecast the package would add almost 2 million jobs, 1.9 million jobs, cutting the unemployment rate by a point and increase growth by 2 percentage growth points. Now, I know my friend may disagree with those figures, and may disagree with Mr. Bartlett's comment, I am sure you do.

My point is this, we don't have any bill on the floor that we have had over the last 9 months or that is projected, that is projected to increase jobs in the short term. The gentleman knows he and I agree on the trade bills. I think long term that's correct; but the American people, as President Obama observed, can't wait 14 months for the next election. They are struggling, in pain, and at risk today.

And the gentleman last week, or 2 weeks ago, in our colloquy said that there are a number of things, items in the jobs bill on which the gentleman agrees or his party agrees: bonus depreciation, incentives for veterans jobs training programs, infrastructure, small business tax cuts, unemployment insurance reform. The gentleman referenced those on the floor. Clearly there ought to be some areas where we can get agreement.

Yesterday, as the gentleman may have noted on the floor, in the debate I stated that we were debating a regulatory bill that would have no immediate effect on jobs. Your contention is it would depress jobs in the future if that rule were adopted, but I don't think there was any contention during the time of the debate that that would create jobs.

Having said that, I am wondering whether the gentleman has any intention of bringing either the President's jobs bill or a jobs bill that your side would offer, or a jobs bill that the President has offered, to the American people and to this Congress which would be open for amendment and change by your side and by our side in an effort to respond to the American people's great concern that we are not taking actions which are effectively growing jobs in this country.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman for all that information.

Mr. HOYER. I knew you would be happy to receive it.

Mr. CANTOR. I just say to the gentleman, in quoting Moody's Analytics, perhaps what he portrays as our way forward, Moody's chief economist was also the one that made the prediction of an unemployment rate that would not exceed 8 percent as a result of passage of the stimulus bill.

And it makes my point, Mr. Speaker, that the people in this country are tired of Washington making promises it doesn't keep. We're trying to abide

by the trust that the people put in us to try and deliver results.

And right now, as the gentleman correctly points out, the economy is in bad shape. We are trying to do all we can to not only put money in people's pockets, because if there were unlimited money, that would be fine. But what we are trying to do is to encourage investment. We're trying to encourage economic activity so we can see growth happen and occur and jobs created.

That's the way it's done in America, is that we need the private sector to take hold of a signal from Washington that we do believe in free enterprise, that we're not about this government dictating where activity must occur, where and who is deserving of government support.

I mean, this is the essence, I think, of our difference, Mr. Speaker. We're trying to set aside the divide, because clearly we don't agree with the President's approach thus far. We didn't agree with the stimulus approach, and I think the facts have borne out that we were right, that stimulus spending out of this government did not produce the results that the administration promised.

We believed then and we believe now the key to economic growth going forward is to increase the competence, is to bolster the entrepreneurial private sector in this country. It's about innovation. From innovation comes jobs, comes manufacturing; but we need to get Washington out of the way and out of the business of creating harm.

The gentleman, Mr. Speaker, quotes all kinds of people; but I can quote my constituents, as I am sure many of his go to him and say can you stop making it so difficult for us to create or run a business? We need to be a startup country again, Mr. Speaker, and we need to see that type of economic activity. That's what will bring on growth.

So what we have said is, no, the President's all-or-nothing approach is unacceptable. It has been rejected by the American people. They don't want the my-way-or-highway kind of conduct.

And what we see out there, Mr. Speaker, is some conduct on the part of the administration that is just not becoming and of a helpful mode. How is it helpful out there to aim at particular sectors of industry, to aim at business in general when we're wanting the businesses to create the jobs?

So what we have said is, no, we are not for voting on tax increases in this House, which is what the President's proposal is about. We're not for accepting his desire to make it more difficult for charities to be successful. That's what's in the President's plan. I'm sure the gentleman would not agree that we ought to limit deductions to charities, and that's what the President's bill does, something that's not very helpful in today's economy when people are so in need of help by charities.

So we said, fine, set aside those differences and let's look at where we can

agree. So we said we'll bring the trade agreements to the floor. We've been asking for that, as has the gentleman. And I will say, Mr. Speaker, he has been a stalwart of trying to help get those bills through, and I appreciate that, as do many of the Members on both sides who support free and fair trade.

But I would say we also note the President's remarks in his speech to the joint session where he said he would support our efforts in regulatory relief so that we can make it easier. We can make it easier for people going into business in a sensible way. We continue to bring bills forward on that note every week. We brought two forward this week and, as I indicated earlier, will again next week.

We will also be bringing forward the 3 percent withholding bill at the end of October that the gentleman well knows is a big concern to not only, to not only the private sector, but also to institutions like public universities that have already come and approached me and said, you know what, if you don't do something to remove that requirement, we're going to end up having to pay more for our contracts to our vendors.

□ 1510

So we're bringing that bill to the floor. We also are having bills that will come out of the Financial Services Committee that echo what the President said in his speech to us, that echo the President's stated desire to want to help small businesses access financing. We've got to make sure that we're doing everything there so it's not so difficult. We also intend to bring forward measures towards helping small businesses take advantage of their expenses so they can expense the costs that they incur to grow their businesses and take advantage of that to see if we can grow.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman indicates we need to have hearings and we need to do things on the President's jobs bill. I think we've indicated, and again, the Ways and Means Committee had hearings related to unemployment insurance reform, something that the President indicated that he wanted to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, no, we're not going to bring up the President's bill in whole because we don't believe in raising taxes and in more stimulus spending, but we are going to take the parts that we can agree on. And we've taken that posture again and again. It's a reasoned approach when you have two sides that have disagreement to say we're going to focus on commonality and transcend those differences.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

First of all, let me say that the gentleman knows full well that the President's jobs bill does not include revenues. The President suggested in the short term—and we ought not to raise revenues, as a matter of fact. In the

short term, what we need to do is put more money back into people's pockets.

The jobs bill, he did suggest ways to pay for that. And he suggested, as did Bowles-Simpson and Rivlin-Domenici, that that be paid for in the coming years so we do not dampen down the economy at the same time we are trying to stimulate the economy.

The gentleman says that the bill, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, didn't work, and his comment was that the economy is in bad shape. Yes, the economy is in bad shape. It started being in bad shape in 2007, as the gentleman knows, when we went into the deepest recession he and I have experienced in our lifetime. And it remained in place, and the year that this President took office, we lost 786,000 jobs that month. After we passed the Recovery Act, as the gentleman knows, I'm sure, we created 2 million jobs over the last 24 months. The fact of the matter is it worked. Unfortunately, almost no economist understood the depth to which the recession had taken us.

The gentleman didn't support the Recovery Act—I understand that—nor did his party. Perhaps those 2 million jobs would not have been created. In fact, there was another bill, of course—the gentleman hates history, I know—that was passed that created 22 million jobs that no Republican supported. So I tell you, my friend, that when we compare economic performance of policies, one has created a lot of jobs and one lost a lot of jobs in the last decade.

And I will tell my friend when he says that the American people don't support the jobs bill, in fact, I want to tell my friend The Washington Post-ABC news poll says 52 percent of Americans support the American Jobs Act, and 58 percent of Americans believe the American Jobs Act will improve the jobs situation, including in that number 52 percent of Independents. In a Gallup poll, Americans support Obama's plan to pay for the American Jobs Act, 70 percent of Americans support increasing taxes on some corporations by eliminating certain deductions. I think some of your Republicans have said the same thing. Sixty-six percent support increasing revenues on individuals earning at least \$200,000. Now, again, the President did not suggest doing that now, as the gentleman knows, just as the commissions did not suggest doing that now.

But what I have said to the gentleman and what I believe to be the case, and he says the Ways and Means Committee had a hearing today, that hearing was not on a comprehensive jobs package. It was on an important issue, no doubt about that, but there has been no comprehensive effort to put together in the short term a bill which will bring jobs to Americans that they need now.

The President's bill, we believe, will do that. We understand that there may be opposition. We also understand that there may be change. But there has

been no vehicle brought to this floor since the President spoke over 2 weeks ago to allow this House to work its will. You may have the majority of votes on it, but let the American people see who wants to create jobs. The gentleman says we don't create jobs. He is exactly right in a certain sense; but in another sense, as he says, we create an environment in which jobs are created, in which the economy grows, and in which people feel comfortable.

One of the things I want to say to my friend that I hope he would be for, my own belief is that one of the things that will most raise confidence will be to have the select committee of 12 come to an agreement on cutting \$4 trillion over the next 10 years so that we can get the fiscal house in America in order and to do so by a balanced approach with everything, all of our expenses and revenues, on the table. I would hope my friend would join me in urging the select committee to do that, because I frankly think that is the one thing we could do that will raise the most confidence—not only here at home among Americans, but around the world—in America's ability to address tough questions.

So I would urge my friend to, one, try to come to an agreement with his committee chairs to have a comprehensive jobs bill brought to the floor, whatever you think that jobs bill may be, and then allow us to offer amendments, have the House of Representatives work its will on that; and then, secondly, to join in urging the select committee to work on getting us back to where we were in 2001 with a projected surplus in this country.

Mr. CANTOR. If I could just respond, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I need to correct the record about the gentleman's statement about my not appreciating history. Of course I appreciate history. It is just one's sometimes biased interpretation of that history that I take exception with.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, is there anything I said that you believe is factually inaccurate?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, without getting into specifics, I think the gentleman and I do have a different view perhaps of history at times, not always.

Mr. HOYER. I'll take that as a "no."

Mr. CANTOR. I would say this, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman well knows that the President's jobs bill, as submitted by Mr. LARSON, has been referred to many, many committees. There isn't one committee that's going to have a comprehensive hearing on the bill. So as I said before, we intend to take the areas that we can agree on to work together towards forging a solution so we could actually, as some would say, put a win on the board for the American people.

I would say also, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that there are no cosponsors on the bill that's been sub-

mitted as the President's jobs bill. There are no cosponsors. So if there is such support on the other side, I would guess we'll see a lot of people, a lot of Members signing up for that bill.

I would say, though, to the gentleman that the reason we don't believe that bill is helpful right now is because we don't believe that raising taxes is something you need to do to grow the economy. In fact, it's harmful to growing the economy.

And as far as the gentleman's admonition or statement about the joint select committee, again, if he says "balanced approach," that's a nice way of saying we want to raise taxes. We don't want to raise taxes. As the gentleman knows, he and I have been at the process of trying to forge a solution. Both he and I do want to see outcome and success, because I don't feel that it is in any way helpful to anyone to see the joint select committee fail.

The committee is charged with coming up with commensurate savings in order to increase the Nation's credit limit, so that means we've got to get the cuts. But when the gentleman talks about "big deal," I'm all for trying to fix the entitlements because we know that's the problem facing this country, that the disproportionate driver of the deficits is the entitlements.

□ 1520

We know how to fix them. In fact, our side is the only one that has proffered a wholesale formula to address reform that would last a generation. That's the kind of certainty that I think will help in terms of increasing investment and the appetite for risk in this country to help entrepreneurs grow. The gentleman, his party and the President have rejected our approach and have failed to offer a single formula that will fix the entitlement problem and instead want this so called "balanced approach" that will simply take money out of the private sector, out of the people who have earned it, the small business owners, to continue to fund Washington to let Washington spend money.

And we say if you are not willing and courageous enough to fix the problem, why should we go and make prospects for economic growth that much dimmer by raising taxes?

So, yes, I would say to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, I'm all for as much savings as we can actually accomplish and reform that we can complete, but, clearly, we have demonstrated there are a lot of differences.

So, instead, I would look to the joint select committee to do its work. And I have the full confidence in the appointees by our Speaker that we can see it do its work without a lot of hyperbole and fanfare so we can continue to focus on how we're going to get Americans back to work.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen, I think, in that last discussion a very signifi-

cant discussion between our two parties. Indeed, the Republicans did offer a budget bill which privatized Social Security. They call it a premium support program. It eliminated the guarantee that people would have access to affordable health insurance coverage.

We don't agree with that. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We've rejected that. I would suggest the voters have rejected it. But I will tell the gentleman that we also reject the notion that you can spend great sums of money, as we did in the last decade when your party was in control of the House, the Senate, and the Presidency, and not pay the bill. That's why we went from \$5.6 trillion of projected surplus to a \$10 trillion debt when this President took over.

I will tell the gentleman that paying for what we buy is the right thing to do for our children and grandchildren. And the way you pay for that is called taxes. And we're not for raising taxes. However, we are for paying our bills. And if we want to buy stuff, if we want to confront terrorists in Iraq—which I supported—and if we want to confront terrorists in Afghanistan—which I supported—and if we want to make sure that seniors have prescription drugs, we ought to pay for those, not pass those along to my grandchildren. And you don't have grandchildren yet, but at some point in time you may well have them. And I hope you do have grandchildren. It's a wonderful joy. But we're simply passing the expenses along to them.

As the gentleman knows, we're now collecting somewhere in the neighborhood of 15 percent of revenues, 3 percent below average for the last 40 years. But we continue to buy things. And we bought things at a greater rate in the decade that has just passed than we did in the 1990s. We increased spending at a greater rate. The gentleman knows that. That's not history; those are facts, maybe historical facts, but they're facts.

What I'm telling the gentleman is, with respect to a balanced approach—he then says, well, all that means is you want to raise taxes. No. What it means is I want to make sure that we put everything on the table that is giving us the challenge that we're seeing all over the world of balancing our budget, getting our expenditures in line with our revenues, and that we do so in a way that does not undermine America's national security, its economic well-being, and the welfare of our people. That's what we believe in, that's what we hope this select committee will do, and, yes, we believe that everything needs to be on the table.

If that is not consistent with what your view is, it is consistent with the views of every bipartisan group, the Big Three, if you will—Pete Domenici, former Republican chairman of the Budget Committee in the United States Senate; Alice Rivlin, former CBO director; Erskine Bowles, former

chief of staff for the White House; Alan Simpson, former U.S. Republican Senator from Wyoming; and the Gang of Six that now has over 18 or 19 Republicans and 18 or 19 Democrats saying we need to do.

I hope we can join together to do that. I personally believe that is the most important effort that we could make in bringing confidence back to America and to the perception of America around the world.

Mr. CANTOR. Just one final note, Mr. Speaker, we should just stop buying so much. That's my point.

Mr. HOYER. I yield back the balance of my time.

—

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, and further when the House adjourns on that day, it shall meet at noon on Tuesday, October 11, 2011, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

—

PIPISTREL AND PIPISTREL USA

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the future of electric aviation is upon us in the Centre region of Pennsylvania. Pipistrel and Pipistrel USA, an aviation company in State College, Pennsylvania, won first place in NASA's Comparative Aircraft Flight Efficiency Green Flight Challenge, which took first place September 25 at Charles Santa Rosa, California.

Sponsored by Google, the Green Flight Challenge was created to advance aviation fuel efficiency technologies. Fourteen teams registered and collectively invested more than \$4 million in the challenge. The winning aircraft had to fly 200 miles in less than 2 hours and use less than 1 gallon of fuel per occupant, or the equivalent in electricity, and would be awarded a \$1.35 million grant.

Pipistrel USA's aircraft achieved twice this requirement, flying 200 miles using just over a half-gallon of fuel equivalent per passenger. The team was led by Dr. Jack Langelaan, assistant professor of Aerospace Engineering at Penn State University, and supported by engineers and faculty from numerous departments, local area aviation businesses and facilities. It truly was a team effort.

I want to congratulate Pipistrel USA, Penn State, and all those involved in this project for their hard work and entrepreneurial spirit.

MIDDLE EAST PEACE

(Mr. SARBANES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, the recent Palestinian bid for U.N. recognition effectively abandons direct negotiations as the structure for pursuing peace in the Middle East. To those who question the United States' solidarity with Israel in the face of this bid, the answer is that it is in America's interest to stand strong with its friend and ally.

The Arab Spring is dramatically altering the dynamics of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the wider region. Familiar antagonists are seizing on a new populism to stir up anti-Israel sentiment.

It's no surprise that countries like Iran would seek to hijack the sentiment of the Arab Spring, but who would have predicted that NATO member Turkey would turn against its former ally, Israel, with such ferocity? Among other things, Turkey's behavior appears calculated to establish strategic dominance of the eastern Mediterranean by putting pressure on the Israeli-American alliance.

One critical way for the United States to discourage this kind of adventurism in the region is to continue to affirm its unbreakable bond with the State of Israel.

□ 1530

DEEPWATER RESTORATION: A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, 2010, America witnessed the worst man-made disaster in our Nation's history. Mississippi lost four of her native sons to the explosion; and, over the course of 3 months, nearly 5 million barrels of oil gushed into the Gulf of Mexico, causing extreme economic and environmental damage.

Yesterday, the bipartisan RESTORE Act was introduced that will put the Gulf States on the right path to long-term recovery. The RESTORE Act will send 80 percent of the fines paid by BP to the areas that were most affected from this tragic event and will allow the Gulf States to invest funds in projects and programs designed to rehabilitate the region economically and environmentally.

The act provides States with the flexibility to address their own unique and specific needs with transparency and accountability. Once BP is held accountable for its actions, it's only fair that those hardest hit will receive the relief they desperately need and deserve.

I now urge my colleagues from across the country to do the right thing and support the bipartisan RESTORE Act.

AN INSULT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is something about having a heart and a philosophy that Americans who are not working want to work; Americans who are not rich simply want an opportunity to provide for their families.

I want to congratulate the President today for acknowledging that this economic downfall is not attributable to his actions as a President that happens to be a Democrat. I thank him for mentioning the calamity in China, dealing with the manipulation of currency. It is something we have to address. It is something that has not benefited the United States.

I believe as individuals run for the Presidency, they have every right to do so; but every time they make a statement of insult to the American people, I'm going to address it.

Mr. Cain seems to want to continue, rather than to talk constructively about how we can bring people together, today he announced that those who are on rallies around this country—some in my district, as we speak—he told them, if you are not employed and you are not rich, it's your fault.

Mr. Cain, you need to understand what the common people and person is going through. Understand the common man and stop being high and mighty. I don't know how you can represent all of the people. You need to get a grip and understand what America is all about.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

HONORING THE LIFE OF REVEREND FRED LEE SHUTTLESWORTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, during this CBC Special Order hour, we're going to honor the life and legacy of Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth. And I rise today to pay tribute to a great civil rights leader, Reverend Fred Lee Shuttlesworth, who passed away yesterday at the age of 89.

Reverend Shuttlesworth was a passionate advocate for equal rights and a courageous Freedom Rider. He was one of the leaders of the civil rights movement in Birmingham, Alabama, and a cofounder of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, SCLC. Martin Luther King considered Reverend Shuttlesworth the most courageous civil rights fighter in the South.

Born in Mount Meigs, Alabama, on March 18, 1922, Reverend Shuttlesworth